

REMARKS

Summary of the November 20, 2001, Office Action in the Parent Application

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,999,213 to Tsushima et al.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsushima et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,633,678 to Parulski et al.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsushima et al.

Claim 14-21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsushima et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,316,656 to Ishibashi et al.

Summary of the Preliminary Amendment

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 14, 18 and 21-23. Accordingly, claims 1-23 remain presently pending in this application.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Tsushima et al. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsushima et al. in view of Parulski et al. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsushima et al. Claim 14-21 and 23 stand

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsushima et al. in view of Ishibashi et al. To the extent that the Examiner may consider that these rejections apply to the amended claims, the rejections are traversed as being based upon references, whether taken separately or in any combination, that neither teach nor suggest the novel combinations of features recited in newly amended independent claims 1, 14, 18 and 21-23 and hence dependent claims 2-13, 15-17, 19 and 20.

Independent claims 1, and hence dependent claims 2-13, recite a combination of elements including “at least the operation input unit, the recorder, and the mode selector … enclosed within a main camera body.” Independent claim 14, and hence dependent claims 15-17, recite a combination of elements including “at least the recorder, the mode selector, and the function tester … enclosed within a main camera body.” Independent claim 18 recites a combination of elements including “at least the mode selector, the operation input unit, the recorder, and the function tester … enclosed within a main camera body.” Independent claim 21 recites a combination of elements including “at least the operation input unit, the recorder, and the function tester … enclosed within a main camera body.” Independent claim 22 recites a combination of elements including “at least the input means, the recording means, and the selecting means … enclosed within a main camera body.” Independent claim 23 recites a combination of elements including “at least the recording means, the selecting means, and the testing means … enclosed within a main camera body.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Tsushima et al. merely show a camera setup

system including components such as a pointing device 300 and a disk drive 350a in FIG. 3, a video capture unit 117 in FIG. 4 and a window image in Fig. 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Tsushima et al. neither teaches nor suggests the novel combinations of elements including at least "the operation input unit, the recorder, and the mode selector ... enclosed within a main camera body," as recited in independent claim 1 or at least "the input means, the recording means, and the selecting means ... enclosed within a main camera body," as recited in independent claim 22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Tsushima et al. be withdrawn at least because Tsushima et al. does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 22 and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 5-8 and 9-13.

In rejecting claim 4, the November 20, 2001 Office Action relied on Parulski et al. for a teaching of automatically selecting the help menu when the detachable recording medium having the help menu stored thereon is attached. Applicant respectfully submits that Parulski et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the above-cited feature of claim 1, and therefore fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Tsushima et al. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Tsushima et al. in view of Parulski et al. be withdrawn at least because neither of the references, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1 and hence dependent claim 4.

With regard to claims 14-21 and 23, in contrast to Applicant's claimed invention,

Tsushima et al. merely show a camera setup system including components such as a pointing device 300 and a disk drive 350a in FIG. 3, a video capture unit 117 in FIG. 4 and a window image in Fig. 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Tsushima et al. nor Ishabashi teach nor suggest the novel combinations of elements including at least “the recorder, the mode selector, and the function tester … enclosed within a main camera body,” as recited in independent claim 14, “the mode selector, the operation input unit, the recorder, and the function tester … enclosed within a main camera body,” as recited in independent claim 18, “the operation input unit, the recorder, and the function tester … enclosed within a main camera body,” as recited in independent claim 21, or “the recording means, the selecting means, and the testing means … enclosed within a main camera body,” as recited in independent claim 23. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 14-21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Tsushima et al. in view of Ishabashi be withdrawn at least because neither Tsushima et al. nor Ishabashi teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 14, 18, 21 and 23, as amended, and hence dependent claims 15-17, 19, and 20.

The Office Action relies on Ishibashi et al. for a teaching of a diagnosis mode that includes a function tester for testing functions of the camera if the function diagnosis mode is selected by the mode selector. Applicant respectfully submits that Ishibashi et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the above-cited features of claims 14, 18, 21, and 23 and therefore fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Tsushima et al. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 14-21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Tsushima et al. in view of

Ishabashi be withdrawn at least because neither of the references, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 14, 18, 21, and 23, as amended, and hence dependent claims 15-17, 19, and 20.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-23 are in condition for allowance.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."


CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application, and the timely allowance of all the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
for Sam Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 48,107

Dated: May 16, 2002

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000
Facsimile: 202-739-3001